

S/N 10/544,233  
In response to the Office Action dated March 4, 2010

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant notes that the Office Action Summary Sheet indicates that the Office Action is non-final, but the end of the Office Action contains the standard language used with final actions. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's telephonic confirmation that this action is non-final.

Claim 1 has been amended editorially to provide clarification. No new matter is added.

**35 USC § 102 Rejections**

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Itoh (US 2005/0013583). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a recording/reproduction device for an information recording medium on which video data and audio data are recorded independently of each other. During reproduction from the information recording medium, the control portion controls an operation of the pick-up so that from a head block of the M data blocks in the main sequence, only original audio data of the one block are read out with video data not read out.

The rejection erroneously indicates that Itoh discloses in paragraphs [0098] and [0100] that original audio is read first. However, Itoh is directed to simultaneously reading and reproducing moving image data including both original audio data and video data. Fig. 9 and paragraph [0100] are directed to an operation of reproducing data in post-recording. Moving image data are read out first, followed by reproducing video and audio, and then back-audio data are reproduced. Itoh is not directed to a configuration, as required in claim 1, that from a head block of the M data blocks in the main sequence, only original audio data of the one block are read out with video data not read out. Therefore, Itoh does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 and the rejection should be withdrawn.


S/N 10/544,233  
In response to the Office Action dated March 4, 2010

Claim 4 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependence on independent claim 1. The rejections of this dependent claim should be withdrawn. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: Jun 3, 2010

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &  
LARSON, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2902  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902  
(612) 435-3800

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Douglas P. Mueller  
Reg. No. 30,300  
DPM/lf